



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/550,303	04/14/2000	Brian Haab	S99-066	9147
24353	7590	07/14/2006	EXAMINER	
BOZICEVIC, FIELD & FRANCIS LLP			FORMAN, BETTY J	
1900 UNIVERSITY AVENUE			ART UNIT	
SUITE 200			PAPER NUMBER	
EAST PALO ALTO, CA 94303			1634	

DATE MAILED: 07/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.

09/550,303

Applicant(s)

HAAB ET AL.

Examiner

BJ Forman

Art Unit

1634

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 28 June 2006 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. ☒ The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. ☒ The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
(a) ☒ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
(b) ☒ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
(c) ☒ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
(d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. ☐ The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
7. ☒ For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) ☒ will not be entered, or b) ☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:
Claim(s) allowed: _____.
Claim(s) objected to: _____.
Claim(s) rejected: 10,13-16,18,31 and 33-37.
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: _____
12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). _____
13. ☐ Other: _____.

BJ Forman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit: 1634

Continuation of 3. NOTE: The amendments define the microarray as having "selected, distinct" polypeptides. Applicant cites page 3, lines 17-18 for support of the newly defined polypeptides. The cited passage recites, "the array has a known amount of a selected, analyte-specific reagent". The cited passage describes an "amount" of reagent present on an array. The newly claimed "selected" and "distinct" described the content and/or composition of the polypeptides but does not describe an amount. Hence, the cited passage does not describe "selected" or "distinct" polypeptides as newly claimed. Therefore the amendments potentially introduce new matter into the specification. Applicant's arguments have been thoroughly reviewed, but are not found convincing to overcome the rejections set forth in the Final Office Action. Applicant reiterates previous arguments regarding arrayed polypeptides synthesized in situ having the correct sequence. As previously stated the argument is not commensurate in scope with the claims because neither the previously rejected nor instantly amended claims define or limit the polypeptide sequence. Applicant asserts that Barrett et al do not teach microarrays of 1000 or more discrete regions of polypeptides on an array. The argument has been considered but is not found persuasive because as cited in the Final Office Action, Barrette specifically teaches regions of less than 100 μm^2 separated by 1 μm , portions of which are illustrated (Fig. 4-8). Applicant asserts that Beattie cannot teach a planar array as claimed because they do not teaching deposition via tapping. The argument is not found persuasive for reasons of record. Furthermore, the instant claims do not define a planar array over the substrate of Beattie because Beattie specifically teaches a slide and because the instant claims do not define the array over a slide having nanoporous regions as taught by Beattie. Regarding the secondary references of Chang, Zubay and/or Van Ness, Applicant asserts the references do not cure the deficiencies of Beattie. The arguments are not found persuasive because Beattie is not found deficient.



BJ FORMAN, PH.D.
PRIMARY EXAMINER